

**REMARKS**

In the September 25, 2006 Office Action, the claims were objected to and claims 1, 4-15, 17, and 19-37 stand rejected in view of prior art. In the September 25, 2006 Office Action, all of the pending claims stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the September 25, 2006 Office Action, Applicant has cancelled claims 1 and 4, has amended claims 5-8 to place them in independent form, respectfully traverses the prior art rejections to claims 5-15, 17, and 19-37, has included comments to support the traversals, and has amended the second numbered claim 36 as indicated above. Further, Applicant has added claims 38 and 39. Thus, claims 5-15, 17, and 19-39 are pending, with claims 5-8 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

***Claim Objections***

In item 1 of the Office Action, the claims were objected to because there were two claims numbered 36. In response, Applicant has amended the second claim originally numbered 36 to 37.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4-7, 19-20, 24-33, and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0077340 (Forsyth) in view of International Publication Number WO02/14976 (Hwang).

Further, in item 4 of the Office Action, claims 8-15, 17, 21-23, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Forsyth and Hwang in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,039,423 (Daniel et al.). In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 1 and 4, has amended claims 5-8 to place them in independent form, respectfully traverses the prior art rejections to claims 5-15, 17, and 19-37, and has included comments to support the traversals, as mentioned above.

More specifically, claims 5-8 recite that the idle screen of the mobile communication system includes screens divided into regions and that one of the regions includes a menu corresponding to the content information displayed in another region or has access to a wireless Internet web site provided in the form of a quick launch icon. The Office Action relies on Forsyth to show this feature because the other two cited references are silent and fail to disclose or to suggest this feature. The Office Action specifically references paragraph [0007] to show this feature. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Forsyth actually teaches away from a mobile communication system having multiple screens having divided regions.

Specifically, in contrast to the recited features of claims 5-8 of the present application, Applicant respectfully asserts that Forsyth explicitly states in paragraph [0007] that “the field of Personal Computer (‘PC’) user interaction is *non-analogous* to mobile telephone device user interaction design” in part at least because of the screen size (emphasis added). Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that Forsyth implicitly states that mobile telephone device screens are not large enough to display multiple windows because Forsyth explicitly states in paragraph [0007] that the large PC window can display multiple application windows and thus the PC window and mobile telephone device are non-analogous. Moreover, as seen in

the Figures of Forsyth, Forsyth fails to disclose or to suggest a mobile telephone device screen having screens divided into regions.

Further, claims 5-8 of the present application recite a mobile communication terminal screen having a region having divided screens, each of which has a display mode. It is acknowledged that Forsyth fails to disclose or to suggest this feature for a first region, and thus, the Office Action relies on Hwang, specifically page 6, lines 10-22 thereof. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Hwang only discloses that various types of information can be displayed and fails to disclose or to suggest divided screens. Further, as seen in the Figures of Forsyth, Applicant respectfully asserts that Forsyth fails to disclose or to suggest this feature in any region. Since each reference fails to disclose this feature, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination also fails to disclose or to suggest this feature.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Daniel et al. are cited to show a channel switch display and also fail to disclose or to suggest the aforementioned features.

Applicant respectfully asserts this arrangement is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does not make the modification obvious, unless the prior art suggests the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicant's unique arrangement.

Moreover, Applicant believes that the dependent claims are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from the independent claims, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art

Appl. No. 10/522,598  
Amendment dated December 6, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2006

of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claims, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

***New Claims 38 and 39***

Applicant has added dependent claims 38 and 39, which respectively depend on claims 5 and 6. Thus, Applicant believes that these claims are allowable for the reasons stated above, and are further allowable because they contain additional limitations.

Examination and consideration are respectfully requested.

\* \* \*

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 5-15, 17, and 19-39 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Todd M. Guise  
Reg. No. 46,748

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: 12/6/06

G:\10-OCT06\YS\GK-US055009 Amendment.doc